DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 027 CS 508 434

AUTHOR Weaver, Richard L., II; Cotrell, Howard W.
TITLE Forced Discipline in the Basic Speech-Communication Course.
PUB DATE 18 Nov 93
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Communication Research; Definitions; *Discipline Policy; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; *Speech Communication; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Forced Discipline; Speech Communication Education

ABSTRACT

Forced discipline refers to the specific procedures, routines, and standards required for carrying out course-related tasks. This paper discusses various facets of discipline, then looks at how 160 students in a basic speech-communication course respond to forced discipline. The paper next looks at how 30 basic-course directors define forced discipline and offers examples and opinions of the directors regarding forced discipline. The paper concludes with suggestions and guidelines for handling discipline in basic, speech-communication courses. Four footnotes are included. (Contains 10 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 027

Forced Discipline in The Basic Speech-Communication Course

Richard L. Weaver II
and
Howard W. Cotrell

Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0234

Running head: FORCED DISCIPLINE

Paper presented at the
Speech Communication Association
Annual Convention
Miami Beach, Florida 33139

November 18, 1993

CS508434

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Weaver

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Forced discipline is those things students must do to successfully complete a class. They are the specific procedures, routines, and standards required for carrying out course-related tasks. In this article, we discuss various facets of discipline first, then we look at how students in a basic speech-communication course respond to forced discipline. In the third section, we look at how basic-course directors define forced discipline. Directors offer examples and opinions of it as well. Finally, we provide some suggestions and guidelines for handling discipline in basic, speech-communication courses. (92 words)

Forced Discipline in The Basic Speech-Communication Course

Forced discipline is those things students must do to successfully complete a class. They are the specific procedures, routines, and standards required for carrying out course-related tasks. The problem with forced discipline is that many of the things that instructors or directors (Footnote 1) of basic-communication courses require of students tend to operate against ideal humanistic teacher-student relations--often, precisely those things directors want to promote in their basic-communication courses. In other words, forced discipline may serve as an impediment rather than a catalyst to effective learning and, thus, dehumanize rather than humanize. Students perceive dehumanization when they perceive an attack or threat to their self-concept or a significant loss or damage to their personal dignity. (Rich, 1985, p. 97)

In his book on discipline, John Martin Rich further characterizes what constitutes dehumanization:

> "Any interpersonal relationship that has one or more of the following effects on the individual is dehumanizing: (1) brutalization, (2) humiliation in terms of one's sense of dignity, (3) a situation that causes a partial loss or aggravation of one's sense of identity, (4) a situation wherein one perceives him or herself as treated as a thing, object, or piece of property to be manipulated rather than a person to be respected, and (5) a situation that causes individuals to feel that they are not in control of their actions, but that the actions are caused by known or unseen forces which cannot be resisted" (Rich, 1985, p. 97).

It is not easy to remove the conditions that dehumanize. In some cases, directors do not recognize the conditions. In other cases, the conditions are present in large, basic courses because the conditions are what make it easier to instruct and control large groups of individuals. In still other cases, the conditions are an entrenched, automatic, and often-accepted part of education. Grades, examinations, and impersonal large-lecture situations may be some conditions that meet all of the above criteria.

In this article, we will discuss various facets of discipline first, then we will look at how students respond to forced discipline. In the third section, we will look at how basic-course directors view forced discipline, and finally, we will provide some guidelines for handling discipline in large basic-communication courses.

Facets of Discipline

Nobody reading this would disagree about the value of treating students as free and responsible human beings. Also, nobody reading this would disagree about the value of genuine caring when it comes to the treatment and education of students. And yet discipline and class control are essential--especially when the number of students increases, as in large basic-communication courses. Often, these ideas are at odds with each other: freedom and caring versus discipline and control. At odds or not, directors <u>are</u> in the business of enforcing standards and building patterns of cooperation that will maximize learning and minimize disruptions. Often, some freedom and caring are sacrificed when standards are enforced and discipline is maintained.

Here is a brief list of some facets of discipline:

--Discipline "is important because no group of people can work together successfully without establishing standards of behavior, mutual respect, and a desirable system of values that leads each person in the group to develop self-control and self-direction" (Howard, 1980, p. 24).

--Discipline "does not result if a teacher adopts an inflexible punitive approach or if a teacher is too permissive, pretending that annoying behavior does not exist" (Howard, 1980, p. 24).

--Discipline "should be firm and fair" (Howard, 1980, p. 24).

--Discipline must be consistent. That is, students who do something wrong must receive the consequences, but they expect anyone else who commits the same offense to receive similar consequences. (Howard, 1980, p. 24)

--Discipline should be handled in a friendly manner. Instructors and directors must be understanding, tolerant, and sincere with students. (Howard, 1980, p. 25)

These are important facets of discipline. They are fairly universal standards although they are unlikely to be applied in the same manner in all situations. As important as they are, however, often students do not view discipline, its need or importance, in the same way as directors.

Student Responses to Forced Discipline

In a large basic-communication course, we asked students in one of five lecture sections to answer the following question: "What is your opinion of (reaction to) 'forced discipline.'" We put the definition with which we began this article (the first sentence) on the chalkboard, and we gave students three examples so they would know what we were talking about: attendance requirements, performance specifications (number of evidence sources, length of speeches,

complete sentence outlines), and examination stipulations. This occurred two-thirds of the way through a fifteen-week semester (Week 10). Students responded on a half-sheet of paper. We received 160 responses. The responses represented a wide variety of viewpoints. We will offer examples of those against, some samples of those who did not take a position, and then a sampling of some of those who favored forced discipline.

Students Against Forced Discipline

Forty responses, or twenty-five percent, were strongly negative to forced discipline. Some students said since they were paying for their education what they did was entirely their choice:

> "It is my feeling that since I am paying you to take this course, I should be able to do whatever I want, whether that be attending class or skipping class, not doing one assignment, or whatever. As long as I pass the class, it shouldn't matter how I do it."

Another student expressed the same idea more succinctly:

> "I don't think it should be forced because we pay for the class, and why should you care?"

Several students thought that the idea of forced discipline was immature and childish:

> "Actually, by this time in our education, I find 'forced discipline' quite childish!! [underlined twice] All three of the examples listed are things a dedicated/mature student would do on their [sic] own!"

Another framed the same idea in this way:

"I think 'forced discipline' isn't right in college. By the time we get here, we are responsible enough."

A third student said:

"I don't believe in it because all people should be treated as adults and be able to discipline themselves. If they don't, then they lose out, and it is their own fault."

Another group of students objected to forced discipline because of the pressure and stress they feel it creates. One said:

"Setting rules only puts pressure and stress on people."

Another student said:

"Students have enough to worry about with tests and quizzes."

A third student said:

"I feel that forced discipline only makes students feel more stressed than they already are. Knowing that we have to fill such requirements only makes the exams and speeches much more difficult than they already are."

A number of students took issue with the word "forced." We used the word to provoke a response. The word "discipline" alone, we thought, would not generate the same reactions from students.

"My reaction to 'forced discipline' according to the defintion is strongly against it because I do not like set rules. I believe flexibility is the key to variety and everyone needs this."

Another student said:

"I disagree with forced discipline because students must <u>want</u> to do successfully [sic], not be <u>forced</u> to do well. If students <u>choose</u> to fulfill course requirements that means they want to be successful. If they just do

things because they have to, they could probably care less about the subject."

Still another student said:

"I feel that forced discipline implies that we are not competent enough to make our own decisions. The more forced discipline is given to me, the more I want to rebel and be resistant."

Summarizing the position of those who were strongly opposed to forced discipline were several students who expressed their views this way:

"There is no such thing as forced discipline because any person can do anything he/she wants. No one person can have control over your life unless you let them. No one can force you to obey their 'rules.' The only rules we must obey are those of the law."

A second student expressed this view:

"Forced discipline in some areas, such as the government's or the military's use, is necessary. But in the classroom, it is a detriment because it stifles the learning process."

A third was a bit more expressive:

"This class should be worth 6 credit hours with all the shit you guys make us do. It is definitely challenging. I don't think discipline should be any of your business.... We pay for the classes. If we can pass them without going then it is our business, if not then it's our fault. So get off the big discipline BANDWAGON [sic]."

And finally, these responses:

"I find forced discipline an insult to my intelligence. I find this is perhaps a way for the director to control his students. Maybe for some

students this type of control is necessary--for me it is not."

"I feel that it sucks! If a student can understand the material without going to class why should he?"

Students Neither For Nor Against Forced Discipline

Thirteen students took a more central position--neither for nor against. Most said things like: "I have a mixed opinion," or "I think that it is sometimes needed, but other times it should be the student's decision on what he/she does in the class," or "It is the teacher's perogative," or "Forced discipline happens in every class whether we want it to or not," or "Some forced discipline is all right, but not too much," or, finally, "My opinion of forced discipline is that it is good in some ways and bad in others. I feel that some people will react well to it and others won't." Indeed, that is precisely what we found.

Students For Forced Discipline

Two-thirds of the students polled reacted positively to forced discipline. Some said it was necessary to maintain order; "I believe that there needs to be rules." Some thought it was a terrific motivator; "It makes students try harder," or "It provides some motivation for students who tend to be a little lazier than others," or "I think it is one of the ways to get slugs to work." Another student said this about the motivational aspect of it: "To some extent, forced discipline is a good idea. Especially in courses like this where people wouldn't make an effort unless they had to." Another student, too, responding to the nature of the basic-communication course, said, "Forced discipline provides guidelines to those students too lazy or too stupid to realize what it takes to get as much out of this or any other course as possible."

There were numerous other positive responses, too. Some thought it caused students to perform higher quality work; "They make assignments a little more difficult, but I also believe that the quality is improved." Some thought it was a requirement for uniform grading; "This makes it fair to everyone when grading. Teachers can't give the same grades to people who put more or less into a certain assignment." Some said it helps to organize classes; "It sets up a structure and makes it easier for instructors to grade," or "There is nothing worse than a class without structure." Some said it increases learning; "The student learns more and gets more out of the course." Some, too, said they are part of education; "I just accept them as part of being in school," or "Some things need to be done to successfully complete a course--and, as long as they are not unrealistic, I understand that they must be done."

Many students related forced discipline to themselves and self-improvement. Some thought that it results in a sense of accomplishment; "I usually feel a greater sense of accomplishment after completing an assignment with many requirements," or "I have no problem with forced discipline as long as the instructor is challenging me to improve myself." Some said that it contributes to positive self-esteem; "It helps self esteem and helps keep individuals directed." On a related note, one student said: "These things cause <u>good</u> habits to form in students." What kind of good habits? Another student said:

> "I feel that it is <u>necessary</u> in an educational situation. It lets students know that education is a SERIOUS matter. It forces students to attend, pay attention, and <u>STUDY</u>."

In a related response, another student said:

"The best thing to do is do as you are required; it will help you to follow rules later. You are never able to do what you want, and so the rules are good, and will help later in life."

Is it really forced? One student didn't think so and said:

"I don't think these kinds of things are really forced. We, as students, should have these as personal goals. After all, it's our choice to be here."

What we found, for the most part, was that students had grown accustomed to forced discipline. At the introductory college level at least, students were willing to accomodate it if not accept and internalize it as a useful, motivating, and educationally, if not personally, beneficial aspect of higher education--as long as it was reasonable.

Directors' Viewpoints

What led us to the topic of forced discipline in the first place was a student's research project on our basic speech-communication course. Using pre- and post-tests on randomized but separate groups of approximately 100 students in the course, the dependent variables being McCroskey's "Personal Report of Communication Apprehension" (PRCA-24) and a "Locus of Control" scale, the student received significance levels of .0003. One conclusion was that, with respect to results on these scales, something significant was occurring in this introductory, hybrid, speech-communication course to bring about this high level of significance.

Whether the results occurred because of the six major, graded course activities (Footnote #2), was not determined. Whether the results occurred because of the structure of the course, also, was not determined. The course

begins with five weeks of interpersonal communication followed by five weeks of small-group communication followed, finally, by five weeks of public speaking. This allows students to become acclimated (for ten weeks) to the classroom, instructor, students, assignments, and expectations before having to give their first speech. Whether or not the results (a significance level of .0003) occurred because of the fifteen lectures of the course was not determined either (Footnote #3). Someone suggested that the results are likely to accrue from a combination of these three things: activities, structure, and lectures. Then, one of the authors suggested it may be because of "forced discipline"--or a combination of the three elements outlined above in addition to forced discipline.

This "discovery" came to the authors just prior to the 1992 Midwest Basic Course Director's Conference in Dayton, Ohio. For that reason, we took our concept to the Conference, and we asked the directors for their reaction to "forced discipline." We asked them to define it, give an example, and then tell how they feel about it. We received responses from thirty basic speech-communication course directors--all who were present at the session where the issue was raised. (Footnote #4) Here is a sampling of their responses:

Directors' Definitions

The question was simply, "What is 'forced discipline'?" The answers were specific and related to each other:

"Requiring a specific behavior response as a basis for evaluation."

"The use of tested structures to give some order to the chaos in the classroom and in the lives of students."

"When students are required to do certain things or follow definite procedures."

"Policies which will help students to learn and which you require that they follow to achieve a good grade in the course or on an assignment."

"Teacher behaviors which are intended to 'control' (facilitate) student behavior and, thus, student learning."

"Requirements that result in penalties if not completed."

"Requiring or encouraging a set of guides or standards in terms of behavior, application, and conceptualizing."

"Standards and requirements."

"There are choices to be made within some set of parameters; choices are based on analysis and adaptation of speaker, audience, occasion, and message in a process and receiver-oriented framework."

Some Directors' Examples

The examples given by directors of basic courses included the wide range of requirements represented in many basic courses: attendance, number amd type of class assignments, how to prepare each assignment (typed, number of sources, supporting materials), outline requirements (number of main heads, introduction, transitions, body of speech, conclusion, citation of sources, references), quizzes and examinations, grading, requirements for observers (evaluation forms) and audience members (listening, courtesy), outside of class assignments, time limits, and competency standards were the examples given. One director summarized the examples when she said, "I provide the vessel, they provide what goes into it." The list developed is not unlike the list of items that occur in most basic speech-communication courses.

Directors' Opinions About Forced Discipline

Most directors find forced discipline a necessary evil. Although they support it, they do not like it: "I think uniform requirements are helpful--that doesn't mean I like them." Many simply said, "You have to have forced discipline to help students learn." Also, there were several other more extended answers to this request. One was:

> "Perhaps one of the keys to the issue of forced discipline is that the instructor has to be responsible enough to carefully think about why he or she is employing certain forced-discipline techniques. Do you have an attendance policy just because. Or, do you have an attendance policy because part of learning about public speaking, for example, is by seeing others present speeches and by engaging in an evaluative process and, thus, applying
> the public-speaking principles they have been learning? If the latter is the case, then, again, responsibility rests with the instructor to help 'make' class experiences worthwhile."

The point above is simply that directors need to think about what and why they are imposing discipline on students before they do it. Is it for director convenience, or are there legitimate, appropriate, educationally viable reasons for it?

Another basic-course director said:

> "Since our course is based on the understanding of concepts (rhetorical concepts) in order to more effectively and efficiently apply those concepts in present and future situations, I do 'force' some discussion or application of: invention, organization, style, memorability, and delivery.

I also encourage aspects of establishing a classroom climate suitable to learning: attendance, listening, common courtesy, etc."

Another director responded this way:

"At the basic level, we need to establish the framework within which students must function. However, much of what we teach students is how to function effectively (and creatively) within those constraints. Thus, we establish the frames and they apply the point!!"

Another simply said:

"The secret is in how you as a teacher strike a balance between too much and too little."

McKeachie, in his book, Teaching Tips, calls the attempt to strike this balance a "neat trick" (1986, p. 224). That is, directors "have the neat trick of finding ways of simultaneously satisfying both needs" (p. 224). In this case, it is the needs of students for freedom and responsibility and the director's needs for control and discipline.

One director properly took issue with the word forced:

"Problem with the word "forced" versus motivation to see merit in achieving structured expectations [sic]. If regimentation is perceived without value justification, student behavior will be negative."

Another director called it "structured freedom" which some might claim is an oxymoron. But a number of directors were concerned about stifling or capping students' creativity by carrying forced discipline too far.

Essential issues raised by directors included deciding on why it is being used, providing a reasonable justification for its use, striving for a balance

between too little and too much, and trying to encourage creativity despite the discipline.

One final issue involves directors in courses that involve graduate teaching assistants. One director said, "I personally feel that without these standards the instructional staff find themselves badgered and needlessly harassed by students." As a director who uses numerous graduate teaching assistants (over thirty per term), one author of this article uses forced discipline to help assure consistency and continuity across sections. We (the authors) are certain that fewer problems are encountered by graduate teaching assistants because of well-constructed, written, thorough, and well-explained sets of rules and procedures for the course.

Guidelines and Suggestions

The problems connected with disciplining students are both complex and numerous. There are probably no "right" ways except those that work best in relationship to situation, students, and directors. Nevertheless, from our teaching experience of over twenty-five years (more than eighteen directing a large, basic, speech-communication course) we offer guidelines and suggestions that may help in gaining and maintaining control and, yet, preserving some of the humanization discussed at the opening of the article. This is not a case of "if the shoe fits, wear it." This is a case of taking any combination of ideas mentioned and shaping one's own shoes! No one can give others rules; directors must decide them from what they believe in and feel about specific infractions and standards. Also, they must be designed congruently with who the director is. Ours have been shaped (and continue to be shaped) from our teaching experience; others must do the same.

What we offer here is a list of suggestions that will help directors establish (or at least consider) the context from which rules and standards are developed. We feel that when the context is humanistic, fewer problems occur no matter what rules (as long as they are legitimate and appropriate) are developed. Some of these suggestions have been adapted fronm Alvin W. Howard's list in his article, "Discipline is Caring." (1980, pp. 24-27)

First, directors need to work at being the kind of person students like and trust. If they can maintain the respect of students without being patronizing or condescending, then discipline emanates from a highly credible source and is more likely to be accepted and responded to positively. (Howard, 1980, p. 25)

Second, directors need to try to get to know their students. Directors who know their students often develop a sixth sense for anticipating trouble--or being alerted to trouble--before it begins. The more experience in directing, the more this sixth sense is likely to develop. (Howard, 1980, pp. 25-26) Having graduate teaching assistants on the front lines willing to help anticipate or locate potential problems also helps. They need to be directed to assist.

Third, directors need to be enthusiastic and courteous. If they can keep their sense of humor, they are able to keep all things in better perspective. Students who are attracted to directors because of their enthusiasm, courtesy, and humor are more likely to see them as reasonable, warm, fallible human beings. (Howard, 1980, p. 26)

Fourth, directors need to make their courses interesting and relevant to students' lives. Organization and imagination produce interesting, well-paced courses. If students view the course and the activities and assignments as challenging and worthwhile, they are less likely to see the discipline at all,

or, if they do, they are likely to view it as relevant and necessary. (Howard, 1980, p. 26)

Fifth, directors need to carefully structure their course. Little should be left to chance. Structure is organization. (Johnson, 1980, pp. 16-19) When the stage is properly set in advance, instruction and discipline are likely to go as smoothly as possible. Structure makes management a matter of routine. Once directors establish a routine, they can produce needed cooperation and rule-following thereafter with little effort. (Jones, 1987, p. 41)

Sixth, within the structure established, directors need to give reasonable assignments that are clear and specific. (Lundell, 1982, p. 48) Vague and ambiguous directions are likely to cause frustration, resistance, and hostility.

Seventh, directors need to be supportive and helpful to students. Scolding, ridiculing, and humilation result in negative attitudes and bitterness. They need to avoid arguing or getting angry with students at all costs. (Tyrrell, McCarty, & Johns, 1980, pp. 58-60) Often, too, students who were supportive, seeing directors argue or get angry, may become resistant and hostile as well. Students need help in organizing their time, in dealing with complex directions or assignments, and in how to be successful. Any and all advice is welcomed. Directors need to be part of the team, or play coach, rather than just being a bystander or one who doesn't even show up for the game.

Eighth, directors need to let students know they care. (Howard, 1980, p. 26) This may involve determining, preferably jointly with students, what is acceptable and what is not, both in terms of behavior and achievement. (Lundell, 1982, pp. 48-49) If possible, too, it is helpful for students to know that directors recognize their differences. What is acceptable with one group may not

be with another. Whenever differences can be preserved and celebrated, do so. (Hansen, 1979, pp. 152-153)

Caring is demonstrated when students see that directors are interested in what they have to say even though it may not pertain directly to the lesson. Are directors willing to forego doing all the talking? Are they willing to refrain from getting angry at students? (Tyrrell, McCarty, & Johns, 1980, pp.58-60) There is no management technique that can carry a director who becomes easily upset or who does not particularly care about or personally like students.

Ninth, directors need to establish as few rules as possible, and they need to keep them as simple as possible. From time to time, they need to be examined so that unnecessary ones can be eliminated. (Howard, 1980, p. 26)

Tenth, directors need to establish rules and procedures early--at the outset of a course. Directors who do not, are likely to pay for it over and over again. (Jones, 1987, p. 26)

Eleventh, directors need to be fair, firm, and consistent, but they need to follow through. (Jones, 1987, p. 32) Follow through is the motherhood and apple pie of the discipline management business. Without follow through all the rules and procedures mean nothing. Reputations are built or destroyed based on follow through. Not to follow through on just one rule is to weaken the whole system and the director's credibility. (Seeman, 1988, p. 227)

Related to follow through is the quality of the response. The quality level must be consistent as well. One writer expressed it this way, "Your standard of excellence on any job is defined by the sloppiest piece of work that you will accept" (Jones, 1987, p. 45).

Twelfth, directors need to establish rules for the sake of students' education, not just for their convenience. This means that standards and procedures need to be appropriate and professional. (Seeman, 1988, p. 228)

Thirteenth, directors need to provide their rules, if possible, in writing. This has numerous advantages. First, it is less likely that students will misinterpret the rule since it becomes "black and white" rather than "that's not what I heard you say." Second, it is available for future reference, if necessary. Third, it can be provided to students who add the course late or who were absent when the rules were discussed. Finally, this allows future additions or deletions (polishing) so that rules can be adjusted to fit circumstances.

Fourteenth, and finally, in developing rules, it is helpful to show students how the rules will benefit them. To show them how the rules will help them take responsibility for their own lives and learning, will help release them from feeling they are answerable to the director alone. (Smith, 1985, p. 105) If the rules will help them better benefit from the learning that is going to take place, this needs to be demonstrated. For example, a rule that requires students to discover sources for their speeches from the last six months may help discourage plagiarism, but it makes certain that students are focusing on current topics, using current resources, and, perhaps, investigating potential experts to interview for the speeches.

Even to explain the rule of finding sources from the last six months with reference to helping to discourage plagiarism can work. For example, if students know that all of their time and effort will be rewarded, this is helpful. Students resent it when they discover that someone who, at the last minute, borrowed an outline or speech from someone else and turned it in as their own

received a grade as good or better than their own. To be protected from this occurrence by a reasonable rule that can be justified in another way (currency of topic and research), protects responsible students.

Students, of course, value being treated as responsible people. It is emasculating and humiliating (dehumanizing) when others do not respect their capacity to originate and confer their own meanings (Smith, 1985, pp. 94-95); however, in large basic courses, especially those that involve graduate teaching assistants, much time can be wasted if each term the disciplinary wheel is reinvented. Also, it is unlikely that many of the problems that occur throughout the evolution of a course can be anticipated, prepared for, thought through, or appropriately handled on the spur of the moment or in a session or two that focuses on and develops disciplinary procedures. This can be especially wasteful in an applied, skills-oriented course when time may be better spent in other ways.

Of course, students can be involved in the development of some of the rules and regulations--not all. (Lundell, 1982, pp. 48-49) This could be accomplished through early course assignments. A disciplinary focus could be the purpose of an interview, a problem-solving small-group discussion, or early speeches. This would tie together student responsibility and course purposes, if one of those purposes is to provide speech-communication experiences.

Summary

Poor discipline can start a chain reaction that can make instruction difficult, if not impossible. No worthwhile instruction can take place when students are inattentive and talking. The atmosphere of chaos can spread when assignments are unclear, poorly outlined or explained, or purposeless when

accomplished. One student said, "I feel that forced discipline is good because it makes people (students) settle down and do what should be done."

But discipline must be humanizing, appropriate, and professional. Listen to one student responding to some of the requirements in our basic speech-communication class:

> "[The forced disciplinary requirements] challenge you to succeed in college and to learn something while you're at it. The attendance policy [two allowed in the performance sections before final grades are lowered] is stiffer than I've encountered in other courses, but it's not unreasonable. IPC 102 is not a blow-off course, and students know it and therefore expect the tough performance specifications. As far as restrictions like the length of speeches, that's a necessary guideline. The examination stipulation [Students must pass examination three to pass the course.] doesn't bother me 'cus [sic] I always try my best and try to get an A on exams."

The point is, good discipline doesn't just happen by itself. It is the result of careful planning, sound organization, reasonable procedures, and diligent, daily application of routines, standards, and techniques. It all comes back to directors. To be effective, directors must be scholars, actors, artists, personalities, and human beings. And when it comes to discipline, perhaps, the last--being human beings--is the most important.

Notice, for example, how one student who was polled noted the humanness in his or her response: "I think [forced discipline] is good to a point. I like [in this course] how nothing takes us [students] by surprise. I think that is a

necessity. You [referring to one of the author's of this article] handle it very well. It is a tough class, but we know what is coming."

A director and a course are likely to be defined by their forced disciplinary requirements. But the establishment and maintenance of good discipline is a skill. Like other skills, it requires constant practice if directors are to retain mastery of it. With the use of the guidelines and suggestions in this article and the personal shaping and molding effective discipline requires, added to directors' basic abilities, directors can achieve mastery and continue to perform as effective and respected disciplinarians. Forced discipline is an important, constructive, and accepted part of basic speech-communication courses. It takes effective directors to make it humane.

Footnotes

1. To save space, we will use the word "directors" rather than "instructors and directors" or just "instructors" throughout this article. Please be aware that when we use the word "director" or "directors" we are talking about instructors of courses as well.

2. The activities include a dyadic encounter, an information-acquisition interview, a learning group, a problem-solving group, an informative speech, and a problem-solving (persuasive) speech--six, graded, speech-communication activities all together.

3. The focus of all lectures in the course is "control"--trying to assist students in getting better control of their lives through communication. They are practical, improvement-oriented, motivational lectures.

4. The authors would like to thank all those basic-course directors who responded to the question, provided examples, and offered opinions on forced discipline. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

References

Hansen, J. M. (1979). Discipline and classroom management: Different strokes for different folks. NASSP Bulletin, 428, 40-47.

Howard, A. W. (1980). Discipline is Caring. In E. H. Weiner (Ed.), Discipline in the classroom (Second Revised Edition) (pp. 24-27). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Johnson, S. O. (1980). Better discipline: A practical approach. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Jones, F. H. (1987). Positive classroom discipline. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Lundell, K. T. (1982). Levels of discipline: A complete system for behavior management in the schools. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

McKeachie, W. J. (1986). Teaching tips: A guidebook for the beginning college teacher (8th ed.). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Rich, J. M. (1985). Innovative school discipline. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Seeman, H. (1988). Preventing classroom discipline problems: A guide for educators. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.

Smith, R. (1985). Freedom and discipline. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Tyrrell, R., McCarty, F. H., & Johns, F. (1980). The many faces of anger. In E. H. Weiner (Ed.). Discipline in the classroom (2nd ed.) (pp. 58-64). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.